

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CHANCE SIMS and NOVELLA COLEMAN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LAKESIDE SCHOOL,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C06-1412RSM

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on defendant's motion for protective order. (Dkt. # 111). This motion arises from a June 18, 2007 minute order issued by the Court in which the Court declined to sign a stipulated protective order proposed by the parties on the grounds that "the Court [would] not grant broad authority to file documents under seal simply because the parties have designated them as confidential in the course of discovery." (Dkt. #67). Further, the Court noted in its minute order that "[n]othing in this Order prevents the parties from proposing a new Protective Order without the broad language contained in Paragraph 8." *Id.* Defendant now asks the Court to enter an amended order which it argues complies with the requirements set forth in Local Rule 5(g). The amended language indicates that the "filing party shall, by motion or stipulation, seek an order from the Court permitting the Confidential or Highly Confidential information or material to be filed under seal in accordance with Local Rule CR 5(g)(2)." (Dkt. #113, ¶ 8). Plaintiffs respond that they have never agreed to the new

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER - 1

1 language proposed by defendant. (Dkt. #126).

2 Having reviewed defendant's motion, plaintiffs' response, defendant's reply, and the
3 remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS:

4 (1) Defendant's Motion for Protective Order (Dkt. #111) is DENIED. The Court agrees
5 with plaintiffs that they have never agreed to the new language proposed by defendant.
6 Although the original stipulated protective order was agreed on by the parties, the Court
7 declined to adopt that order, and the amended order proposed by defendant contains language
8 that plaintiffs clearly did not agree to. Further, the Court stands by the language contained in its
9 July 18, 2007 minute order indicating that when parties "ask for involvement of the Court, they
10 must make the requisite showing as to each document." (Dkt. #67). Defendant has made no
11 such showing pursuant to Local Rule 5(g) to justify action by the Court. The Court reiterates
12 that the parties may agree on confidentiality among themselves.

13 (2) The Clerk shall forward a copy of this Order to all counsel of record.

14 DATED this 11 day of September, 2007.

15 

16 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27